PAPISTS PROTESTING Againſt Protestant Popery.

IN

Anſwer to a Diſcourſe Entituled,

A Papiſt not Miſ-repreſented by Proteſtants.

BEING A

VINDICATION

Of the

Papiſt Miſ-repreſented and *Repreſented*,

And the *Reflections* upon the Anſwer.

With Allowance.

LONDON,

Printed by *Hen. Hills*, Printer to the King's Moſt Excellent Majeſty, for His Houſhold and Chappel. 1687.

Printed by Eyre, Hill, Printer to the King's
Most Excellent Majesty, for His Household and

PAPISTS PROTESTING AGAINST Protestant-Popery.

MY *Replier* begins with Complements; and I cannot but admire his Art of weaving Raillery into them so neatly, that every Eye will not discern which is which. But of all his Complements, I take the *Reply* it self to be the greatest. Now in good Manners I should take my turn with my Complements: but am forc'd to drop these, and stand upon my guard; for the *Replier*, while he Complements me with one Hand, is giving me a Box with the other; in his very next Lines calling in question my *Honesty*, without any mincing it at all. In the Mis-representation of a Papist, he says, *I have shew'd some Art, but very little Honesty.* The *Replier* said just before, that he would *complement* P. 1. *no more*, and is as good as his word. As for me, I am much mistaken, if I find not upon occasion more Vouchers for my Honesty, than Art: If I did by chance stumble into it, 'twas against my Inclination, and I am sure I fell up-hill.

But he would have my Art lie in this; that whereas I was told in the *Answer*, *That some of those Mis-representations, which I had made of a Papist, and given out*

for the Proteſtant Character of Popery, were my own ignorant, or childiſh, or wilful Miſtakes, I craftily inſinuate, that they grant all my Miſ-repreſentations of a Papiſt, to be ignorant, childiſh, or wilful Miſtakes. Which is in ſhort, the *Anſwer* gives *ſome*, and I take *all*. And yet thoſe two little Words, upon which the whole Streſs and Truth of his Charge lie, are neither in the *Anſwer* nor *Reflections*; but are providentially juggled in here by himſelf, to give the Reader an early taſte of his own Honeſty, while he challenges mine. The *Anſwerer* had
P. 10. ſaid, *Muſt the Character now ſuppos'd to be common to Proteſtants, be taken from his ignorant*, &c. *Miſtakes?* The *Reflecter* ſays, *Becauſe you ſay my Character is made up of falſe Apprehenſions, ignorant*, &c. *Miſtakes*. What difference is here in ſenſe at all? And what difference even in words; ſave that I add *falſe Apprehenſions*, which the *Anſwerer* likewiſe has in the very next page? Neither of us mention *all* or *ſome*, which the *Replier*, not without reaſon, ſuſpects of craft. As the *Anſwerer* thereof meant, I aſſure him, I meant; the whole Character, if he meant ſo; and part only, if he meant no more: Nor did I ever think of extending his Authority farther than he extended it himſelf. If the *Replier* find any Art in this, I for my part, find no Diſhoneſty; and think I have ill luck to fall into his bad Opinion, for keeping preciſely to my Adverſaries Senſe, and almoſt preciſely to his Words.

The *Replier* comes after this with full Cry, and asks,
P. 3. What is *the meaning of all this pother and noiſe about this double Character, of a Papiſt Miſ-repreſented and Repreſented?* Truly I cannot tell, and think he would do well to ask thoſe who make it; for they in all likelihood know beſt. I for my part thought it a very inoffenſive thing, to let People know what *Papiſts* are, and

pray

pray God there be not a fear they ſhould appear what they are, leſt they ſhould be found to be unlike what they are made appear. They have been cry'd out upon, for keeping the People in ignorance of their Doctrines; and when they expoſe them to open view, 'tis ſtrange there ſhould be a noiſe about it. Truly I did not expect it, and I could not imagine a bare Narrative of Matter of Fact ſhould fructifie into *Anſwers*, and *Reflections*, and *Replies*. I did but relate, playing the Hiſtorian, not the Controvertiſt: Not but that, with the liberty of Hiſtorians, who deliver their own Judgment of the Matters they relate, and their Reaſons for it, I diſcover'd what I thought, and ſometimes ſaid briefly why: But every Body will ſee, I made not Diſputing my buſineſs. And yet, I know not how, it is taken, it ſeems, for a Piece of Controverſie, and, which is more unreaſonable, againſt the *Church of England*, and Defences made for her, as if my *Miſ-repreſented Papiſt*, were a *Repreſented Church of England Proteſtant*: Whenas I never gave that Character out for a *Church of England* Character of *Popery*, thought nothing of her Rule or Judgment, nor dreamt of concerning her, or any Body in my Miſ-repreſentation, whoſe Conſcience do's not of it ſelf concern them. All thoſe who have ſuch Idea's of us, as I there draw, I ſaid, Miſ-repreſent us; and to thoſe who have not, I ſaid nothing. He that would know whether he be concern'd or no, has but to ask his own Heart, to which I did then, and do ſtill leave him.

And yet notwithſtanding this harmleſs juſtifying our ſelves, there is a *pother* and *noiſe* it ſeems about the *Papiſt, Miſ-repreſented* and *Repreſented*, and it is as fiercely aſſaulted on every ſide, as if it came to declare open War, and bid Defiance to the World. The *Anſwerer* ſet upon it in the *Miſ-repreſenting* part, and will have that

to

to be *false Apprehensions* of the Author, to be *taken from his Ignorant, Childish, or Wilful Mistakes:* And then the *Papists Represented* he endeavours to overthrow with whole vollies of Objections. Now comes the *Replier*, and tho' he makes it wonderful hard (*p.* 40.) to know what the Faith of a Papist is; yet he acknowledges it in the same page to be true, as the Representer has declar'd it, excepting some few points; and therefore passing by the *Papist Represented* with some light touches only, his main attack is against the *Papist Misrepresented:* and not being willing this should be understood, as if made up of Childish, Ignorant or Wilful
P. 3. Mistakes, he will have it to be the very avow'd Doctrine and Practice of the *Church of Rome.* He will have the *Papist Misrepresented* and *Represented* to be all the same, excepting some very few cases.

And this he has urg'd so far, that I think 'tis not now so much my Personal Concern to make an *Answer*, as the Concern of as many as throughout the whole World profess themselves *Catholics*, to consider the Truth of what is here charg'd against them. The Salvation of their Souls, their Eternity is at stake. If what is here positively asserted against them be true, 'tis high time for them to reform, and to leave off the Doctrine and Practice of so much Heathenism, under a Christian Name. *Protestants*, in hopes of a mutual Condescendence, may flatter them as they please, and tell them, they have Charity enough to think they may be saved; for my part, I declare, if *Popery* be guilty of what he says, it cannot enter into my thoughts, there's any room for it in Heaven: and that there's any more possibility of a passage for its monstrous Extravagancies through the *Narrow way*, than for those of *Barbary* and *Turky*. The *Popery* this Author describes, seems to me a flat Contradiction

diction to the Commandments and the Gospel; and the Professors of it can have no other portion than with Idolaters, Murderers and Adulterers, whose Eternity is to be in utter darkness.

He declares plainly that *Popery* is really that *Anti-christian Religion*, which *Protestants* say it is; that it teaches and practises all those Fopperies, Superstitions, and Non-sense, which have been at any time charg'd against it by *Protestants*. His very Title of *A Papist not Mis-represented by Protestants*, is a condemnation of the Religion to all those horrid shapes and monstrous forms, it has been at any time exposed in by Members of the Reformation. He tells his Reader in the name of all his Brethren, *We charge them* (the Papists) *with nothing, but what they expresly profess to believe, and what they practise*: And in this one Assertion vouches for the Truth of all that Infamy, and profaneness which is laid at their doors. And so gives assurance, that their complaint of being Mis-represented is but vain and idle; for that, what they call a *Mis-representation*, is in reality a *Representation in all the material Points, of the avow'd Doctrine and Practice of the Church of Rome.* That the *Papist Represented* (excepting some very few cases) professes to believe all that the *Papist Mis-represented* is charg'd with. This *the best and wisest Men*, he says (*viz.* of the Reformation) *have believ'd of them*. And *in* Fox's *book of Martyrs we read how many were burnt for not believing, as the Papist Mis-represented believes.* This is the General Character of a *Papist* according to the freshest and most Modern draught of our *Adversary*; So that now to receive a true information of the *Papist's Creed*, we are not to consult the Council of *Trent*, or the Catechism *ad Parochos*, but the writings and Sermons of *Protestants*: For however *Papists* may not know

P. 4.

P. 2, 3.

P. 2.

know what they believe themselves; yet *Protestants* give a true and exact account of them, and are so far Infallible, that the *Papists* certainly are, what they say they are; believe what they say they believe, since *they charge them with nothing, but what they expresly profess to believe, and what they practice.* Upon the assurance of this *Affidavit*, me-thinks, 'twill not be amiss here to receive the satisfaction of knowing, what a *Papist* really is, and what he certainly believes, beyond the possibility of all exception. For since all that proceeds from a Popish hand of this nature, is suspected and challeng'd, and the *double Character of a Papist Misrepresented and Represented* (about which, as the *Replier* says, there is so *much pother and noise*) is questioned as to its Method, its Sincerity and exactness, we'l now follow our Authors call, and learn what *Popery* is, from the Pens of *Protestants:* and especially from some of those, who are supposed to know what *Popery* is; but for the *bad man*, which the *Replier* excepts against, we'l make no advantage of him, but let a better Man take his room.

P. 3.

What Papists are according to the Character given by the most Reverend Father *John*, somtime Lord Archbishop of *York*, in his Book Written for the use of a Lady, to preserve her from the danger of Popery, where he brings in a Papist thus declaring the Belief and Doctrine of his Church.

WE *must Believe the Church of* Rome, *whether it teach true or false.*

If the Pope Believe there is no Life to come, we must Believe it as an Article of our Faith.

We teach that the Gospel is but a Fable of Christ.

That the Pope can dispence against the New Testament, that he may check when he pleases, the Epistles of St. Paul, *and*

and controle any thing avouched by all the Apostles.

That there is an eternal Gospel, to wit, that of the Holy Ghost, which puts down Christs.

That Christ is the Saviour of Men only, but of no Women: For Women are saved by St. Clare *and Mother* Jane.

That we put away Mortal sins, by becoming Franciscans, by a Bishops Pardon for Forty days, and a Cardinals for a Hundred, and the Popes for ever.

That to become a Monk or a Nun, is as good as the Sacrament of Baptism.

That Whoredom is allowed all the Year long, and another sin for June, July, August, *which you most not know: Allowed for this time by* Sixtus Quartus *to all the Family of the Cardinals of St.* Lucie.

That the Pope can make that Righteous, which is Unrighteous.

That the Bishop of Rome *is a God.*

That the Pope may dispence with all Duties, and that our Principles set Men loose from all obligations, in all relations whatsoever, between Magistrates and Subjects, Lords and Tenants, Husbands and Wives, Parents and Children, Masters and Servants, Buyers and Sellers.

That there is not any sin, but is or may be Indulged amongst us; and scarce a known sin, but there is a known price for it, and at our Market-rate you may commit them when you will.

What is the Belief and Doctrine of the Papists, as 'tis deliver'd by *Tho. Beard,* D. D. in his Book intituled *Antichrist the Pope of* Rome.

THey Believe *that Saints departed ought to be Worshipped and invocated with trust and confidence as God himself.*

That the Pope can Canonize them to this Worship at his pleasure.

That Images are to be adored with the ſame degree of honour as is due to their Patterns, contrary to an expreſs precept of the Law.

That the Pardon of ſins here in this Life, and deliverance out of Purgatory in the Life to come, may be bought for Money, and where no Money there no remiſſion.

They make their unwritten Traditions, not one, but the principal part of Gods word.

They place divers counterfeit Books, diſguiſed under the Name of ſome of the Apoſtles, or their Diſciples, full of Fables, Blaſphemies, and Contrarieties, and yet commend them to the World as parcels of the written word of God, and Believe in them as Holy Scripture it ſelf, as the Goſpels of St. Nicodemus, *of St.* Thomas, &c.

The Pope hath ſet up a new God in the Church, namely a piece of Bread in the Maſs; and to their Breaden God they aſcribe power to forgive ſins, to defend from evil both Men and Beaſt, and to bring to Heaven; when as in the mean while moſt horrible Blaſphemies againſt Chriſt himſelf are tolerated and ſlighted over.

The Pope is above Angels and Magiſtrates, he exalteth himſelf above all that is called God, yea, above God himſelf.

They prefer their Saints before Chriſt: They rely more upon the mediation and interceſſion of Saints, than upon the mediation of Chriſt.

They not only equal St. Francis *and St.* Dominick *unto Chriſt, but in ſome things prefer them before him.*

They affirm that whoever dies in St. Francis's *habit cannot be Damn'd, and that it is as forcible for the remiſſion of ſins as the Sacrament of Baptiſm.*

What

What the Papists are as Represented by Mr. *Sudcliffe* in his *Survey of Popery.*

THere is no point almost, wherein the Papists vary not from the ancient Church, the Article concerning the holy Trinity only excepted.

They teach Novelties and false Doctrines concerning the very grounds of Faith; for they believe the Church to be built upon the Pope.

They speak what they can in disgrace of the Holy Scripture.

They give the Office of Christ's mediation to the Virgin Mary, *to Angels and to Saints; they make also Saints our Redeemers,* &c.

For God they Worship Creatures, not only giving divine honour to the Sacrament, but also to Crucifixes and Images of the Trinity, made of Wood, &c. *and they do adore not only Saints, but rotten bones and rags, they know not of whom.*

They overthrow grace, and ascribe the merit of our Salvation, not to God's mercy through Christ, nor to the merit of his passion, but properly *to our own works and merits.*

They cut out the Second Commandment, because it cannot stand with the Popish worship of Images.

They pray before Stocks and Stones, nay they put their trust *in them.*

They make no Conscience to cut Christian mens throats for not yielding to all their Abominations, and think it Conscience to obey the Popes Decrees, tho very unlawful.

The Fourth Commandment concerneth the sanctifying the Sabbath, but the Papists profane it by Worshiping Idols, and frequenting the Idolatrous Mass.

Papists think they do God *good service, when they murder true Christians.*

Amongst Papists, Adultery and Fornication are reckoned amongst lesser Sins.

By the Doctrine of Papists the Devils of Hell may be saved —— *To this purpose they say, that not only wicked and reprobate Men, but also the Devils of Hell may have true and justifying Faith.*

Papists blasphemously make Christ not only a desperate Man without Hope, but also an Infidel without Faith.

They deny Christ to be αὐτόθεος, *and affirming that his Divine Essence had a beginning from some other, they fall within the compass of the Error of the* Tritheites, *which Heresie doth tear the Unity of the Godhead in pieces, and plainly makes more* Gods *than One.*

Papists do diminish the Merit of Christ's Satisfaction, and enervate, as much as in them lieth, the Cross of Christ, and the Effect of his Death and Passion —— *They are Teachers of Antichrist, opposite to Christ, and Enemies of his Cross.*

That Christ is not the Redeemer of all Mankind.

They make Christ inferiour to Saints and Angels, and prefer the Pope before Christ.

Papists make St. Francis *and* Dominick *equal to Christ in divers things, and in some things superiour.*

They give equal honour to a Cross of Wood and Metal, and to Christ, and looking on a Wooden Crucifix, they say, Thou hast Redeem'd us.

They suppose the Virgin Mary *more merciful than Christ.*

Papists account it a small Sin to use Common Women.

Papists believe divers were by their Saints fetch'd out of Hell.

Papists by their irregular Doctrines and Traditions, have

have not only corrupted, but also disannull'd, for the most part, the Law of God.

They deny the Gospel to be a Rule of Perfection, but they doubt not to give that honour to the Rules of Bennet, &c. *They speak more Blasphemously of the Holy Scriptures, than the* Turks *or* Saracens.

To the Images of the Cross and Crucifix, they give as much honour as they do to God.

They fall down like Beasts before the Pope, and Worship him as God, ascribing to him most blasphemously the honour due to Christ.

Popery as a sink, hath together with Heresie receiv'd into it self most gross and Heathenish Idolatry.

Papists say they put no trust in Images, but never did the Gentiles trust so much in the Images of Juno *or* Jupiter, *as the Papists trust in the Images of our Lady of* Loretto, James *of* Compostella, *&c.*

They give divine honour to Images, which they themselves cannot deny to be Idolatrous.

They ascribe mans justification to this Work, and exclude justification, both by Christ's Justice, and by Faith, &c.

The Papists teach their disciples to distrust Gods grace, —— and to trust rather in their own Works and Merits.

Popery is nothing else, but a pack of old and new Heresies.

Papists despise Marriage as Pollutions and fleshly life.

Bennet, Dominick, Francis, *and other authors of feigned Religions took not their Rules from the Gospel, but thought they could frame a more perfect Religion than the Gospel.*

As the Gentiles had one principal God, and divers demy and inferior Gods, so have the Papists.

As the Gentiles believed that every one had his good and bad Genius, so the Papists assign to every Christian a good and bad Angel.

The

The ſecond Council of Arles, cap. 23. *ſheweth it to be a cuſtom of Pagans, to worſhip Trees or Stones, or Fountains, yet our Engliſh Papiſts ceaſe not to go on Pilgrimage to St.* Winifrides *well, nor to worſhip Stocks and Stones.*

The Romiſh Church conſiſts of a pack of Infidels.

They forbid honeſt Wedlock.

The Papiſts Preachers ſeldom teach the People, and when they do it, they preach their own inventions, and tell idle tales without edification.

Both Prieſts and People are moſt ignorant of Matters of Faith, where Popery is profeſs'd.

The Scriptures and Fathers they read not.

In a member of the Catholick Church, ('they ſay') neither inward Faith nor other vertue is requir'd, but only that he profeſs outwardly the Romiſh Religion, and be ſubject to the Pope.

The Papiſts promiſe Heaven to their followers, ſo they profeſs and ſet forward the Popes cauſe, whether they be Murderers of Kings, or Maſſacrers, or Rebels, or filthy Whoremongers, or Sodomites.

They make more conſcience to abſtain from fleſh on Friday, *than to murder Chriſtians.*

Divers points of Popiſh doctrine are ſpecially ſaid to proceed from the Devil.

It is a common practice amongſt Papiſts to give divine Worſhip to dead men.

The Popiſh Church hath no true Biſhops.

The Pope is Antichriſt.

The Popiſh Synagogue hath no true Prieſts.

Popery in many points is more abſurd and abominable, than the doctrine of Mahomet.

Papiſts, that poſitively hold the heretical and falſe doctrines of the modern Church of Rome, *cannot poſſibly be ſaved.*

What

What Papists are according to the Book of Homilies.

IMages in Churches and Idolatry go always both together —— Images in Churches have been, be, and ever will be none other but abominable Idols.

Oenomaus *and* Hesiod *shew that in their time, there were Thirty thousand Gods; I think we had no fewer Saints to whom we gave the honour due to God; and they have not only spoiled the true living God of his due honour in Temples, Cities,* &c. *by such devices and inventions that the Gentile Idolaters have done before them, but the Sea and Waters have as well special Saints with them, as they had Gods with the Gentiles,* &c.

Papists make of true Servants of God, false Gods, and attribute to them the Power and Honour which is Gods, and due to him only.

Image maintainers have the same opinion of Saints, which the Gentiles had of their false Gods.

Image maintainers Worship Stocks and Stones; they give also the honour due to God to their Images, even as did the gentile Idolaters to their Idols.

Who can doubt but that our Image maintainers agreeing in all Idolatrous opinions, agree also with them in committing most abominable Idolatry?

In many Points our Image maintainers have exceeded the Gentile Idolaters in all wickedness, foolishness, and madness, and if this be not sufficient to prove them Image-Worshippers, that is to say, Idolaters, Lo you shall hear, &c.

The Learned and Unlearned, Laity and Clergy, all Ages, Sects and Degrees of Men, and Women, and Children of whole Christendom, have been at once drown'd in abominable Idolatry, the space of Eight hundred years and more.

This

This is the *Proteſtant Character* of a *Papiſt*, and ſuch as I always look'd upon no other, than of a Papiſt *Miſ-repreſented*; and whoever will take the pains to compare it with what I ſet down under that Title, will find there's little other difference between them, but that this is the *Fouler*. But now it ſeems it muſt be
P. 2. no longer a *Papiſt Miſ-repreſented*, but *Repreſented*, and 'tis what the *Beſt and wiſeſt Men have believ'd of them*. And here now what ſhall I ſay? Our *Replier* ſays, theſe are *Great and Good Authorities*, and we may well ſuppoſe they knew what *Popery* was. And for my part becauſe I love not quarrelling, I ſhall ſo far joyn with them; that if *this* be the *Popery* they have hitherto proſecuted with ſo much Fervour and Zeal; if *this* be the *Popery*, from whoſe Infection they have ſo induſtriouſly labour'd to deliver the Chriſtian World, they have done nothing but what is the *duty* of every true Believer. And if 'twas for the not Embracing *this Popery*, thoſe Martyrs recorded by *Fox* paſs'd the Fiery Trial, their Cauſe was ſurely a Glorious Cauſe; and I queſtion not the Triumphs and Crowns of Glory that waited for them in Heaven, were not inferior to what thoſe enjoy'd, who ſuffer'd under *Decius* or *Dioclesian*. And for my part, I am ſo far in earneſt, had I a Thouſand Lives, I would rather chuſe, by the aſſiſtance of Heaven, to loſe them all at the *Stake*, than in the leaſt aſſent to ſo much Heatheniſm, to ſo Foul and Monſtrous a Religion. And what need now of any longer diſagreement? What neceſſity of keeping up Names of Diviſion? *Proteſtant* and *Papiſt* may now ſhake hands, and by one Subſcription cloſe into a Body, and joyn in a fair and amicable Correſpondence. *Popery* has been hitherto the only cauſe of Separation; one part ſeeming to avow and ſupport it, the other as zealouſly endeavouring its Overthrow.

throw: And all the ſtrife it ſeems has been about a *Word.* For now we have been inform'd from *Great and Good Authorities*, what this *Popery* is; what Papiſt in the World is there, that will not ſo far become *Proteſtant*, as to give his hand for the utter ſuppreſſing *this kind* of *Popery?* And when *Proteſtants* and *Papiſts* concur for the rooting out of *Popery*, what poſſibility of Farther Diviſions?

But if, on the other ſide, *this Character* of a *Papiſt* be intended for the ſetting forth the Doctrines and Practices of the Church of *Rome*; if this be deſign'd as a *True Repreſentation* of the Faith and Religion of *Roman Catholics:* Then returns afreſh my Complaint of their being *Miſ-repreſented*; that they ſuffer under the greateſt Injuſtice imaginable; that they are expos'd in *Bears* and *Tigers* Skins, ſo to become a Bugbear to the Multitude; that they are malign'd and render'd odious for the maintaining ſuch Doctrines, which they as heartily deteſt, as thoſe that urge the Charge; and that 'tis no wonder that *Papiſts* are put in the Liſt with *Turks* and *Infidels*, ſince their Religion is thus injuriouſly loaded with Calumnies, and they made the Profeſſors of ſuch Tenets, which bid open defiance to Truth, Honeſty, and Chriſtianity, which ſtrike at the Worlds Redeemer, and are impoſſible to be entertain'd by any Creature, that is one degree above a Beaſt.

I will not deny, but whoſoever will look into the Church of *Rome*, as the *Scavenger* do's into the City, who ſtops no where but at a Dunghil, may rake together ſo much as to defame her with the Inconſiderate and unwary; alas! the Vices of Men in her Communion, their Abuſes of the moſt Sacred things, too abundantly furniſh Matter of this kind. But yet whoſoever ſhall expoſe this for the Doctrine and Practice of their

Church, and describe her, and all in her Communion, by these Rubbish Collections, cannot possibly avoid the scandal of being unjust, and might with as good reason decipher *London* by those loathsom Heaps where all her Filth is emptied. And now since 'tis evident, the Adversaries of the Church of *Rome* do generally thus deal by her, scraping out of every corner of that vast Communion, and in every Age, whatsoever can possibly contribute to make her Infamous; there is too too much reason to complain of her being *Mis-represented*, and no just exception can be made against the Character of the *Papist Mis-represented*, which lays open to the World the Artifice of these unwarrantable Proceedings.

But here now strikes in the *Replier*, who undertakes to explain a Mystery in this Character; and the *Reflecter*, he says, *will have no reason to glory, that he gave the occasion of it.* And this Mystery, it seems, are some P. 3. Faults he has discover'd in the *Mis-representation.*

First, He says, such things are put into this Character of a *Papist*, as *no man in his wits ever charg'd them with*: And yet those very things almost in express terms, and others far more absurd, we see charg'd (as is shew'd above) *by the Best and Wisest of Men, of great and good Authority* with the *Replier*, as he confesses himself, (p. 2.) And this too is to me a Mystery, as well as to him; that what no Man in his wits ever urg'd, and what the former *Answerer* calls *Childish*, and *Ignorant*, or *Wilful Mistakes*, should be now seen Father'd upon Men of so high a Character.

Secondly, and *thirdly*, He complains, that the Opini- P. 4, 5. ons of *Protestants*, and the Consequences they draw from Popish Doctrines, are put into the Character of a *Papist Mis-represented*, as if they were his avow'd Doctrine and Belief. This is a pretty speculative Quarrel,

I

I confeſs, and might deſervedly find room here, were it our buſineſs to conſider the due method of *Miſ-repreſentation* in the *abſtract*: But as our preſent concern ſtands, here's a quaint Conceit loſt, for coming in a wrong place. For what had the Author of the *Papiſt Miſ-repreſented* to do with theſe Rules? He did not intend to Miſ-repreſent any body. His Province was only to draw forth the Character of a *Papiſt*, as 'tis commonly apprehended by the Vulgar, or the Multitude, with the common Prejudices and Miſtakes that generally attend ſuch a Notion. Now I would fain know, whether this Character, as it lies in the Peoples Heads, is diſtinguiſh'd into *Antecedents* and *Conſequents*: Whether they, when they hear one declaiming againſt Popery, *for committing Idolatry, as bad or worſe than that of the groſſeſt Heathens, Worſhipping Stocks and Stones for God*, diſtinguiſh between the *Doctrine* of the *Papiſts*, and theſe *Interpretations* and *Conſequences* charg'd againſt it. Alas! they ſwallow all down greedily, and in the lump; *Antecedents* and *Conſequents* go down with them all at once. Neither do I find much care us'd to prevent this Miſunderſtanding in the People. For who is there, in laying open the Folly, as they will have it, of the *Papiſts*, and poſitively charging them, that *They make Gods of Stocks and Stones*, that *they make Gods of dead Men, and raiſe the Virgin* Mary *to be Co-partner with Chriſt in Heaven*, &c. do's afterwards tell his Auditory, that This is not what the Papiſts themſelves *Believe* and *Teach*; but only what himſelf *Believes* and *Infers* from their Doctrine, as the *Conſequence* or *Interpretation* of it, but they deny.

Truly were our Adverſaries ſo ſincere as to tell their Hearers, that all their Charge againſt *Popery* is nothing more, than what they *think* of our Faith and Doctrine;

I would so far agree with the *Replier*, that this ought not to be call'd Mis-representing, but only saying of us what is not true. But they go beyond this, and in stead of saying *we think so*, they positively say *so it is*: And possess as many as take Idea's from their Words, not barely that they think we Teach and Practise Idolatry, *v.g.* but absolutely, that we do. Nay, our Image-worship is *worshipping Stocks and Stones for Gods*, says the *Replier* in his very next Leaf, without remembring his *thinking*.

And when the People read Books, intended as *Preservatives* against the danger of *Popery*, they are still expos'd to the like Deceit. For what ordinary Reader is there, that finds it positively asserted as above by the Arch-bishop of *York*; *Papists believe the Church of* Rome, *whether it teach true or false. And if the Pope believes there is no Life to come, they must believe it as an Article of their Faith.* What ordinary Reader, I say, is there, that will not swallow this presently as the *Faith* and *Doctrine* of the *Papists*; when at latter end 'tis only what he *thinks*, and a *Consequence* far fetch'd to discredit *Popery* with the Vulgar? And when he's told by another hand, that the common Answer of *Catholics to excuse themselves from Idolatry in their Adoration of the Eucharist, is because they believe the Bread to be God*: Has not he here a fair occasion again of taking this for the *Belief* of a Papist, and that he worships what he *believes* to be a *Breaden God*? Certainly he must be no small *Logician* that can discover, whether this be an *Antecedent* or *Consequent*, whether it be the *Faith* of the *Papist*, or only a *Consequence* of it. For my part, when I see *Popery* describ'd, as if none could be of that Communion, but he *that can bring his Mind to believe the Word of God to be writ but for a few Years only, and afterwards to be abrogated and annull'd: That whatsoe-*

ver

ver God ſays, ſhall be null and void, unleſs the Biſhop of Rome *will and command the ſame.* When I hear that the *Pope* is Antichriſt and *Rome* the Whore of *Babylon*, that *the Papiſts have taken away from the People the Holy Communion, the Word of God, the true Worſhip of the Deity, the right Uſe of the Sacraments and Prayers, and in ſtead of them, have given to pleaſe them, Salt, Water, Oyl, Spittle, Bulls, Jubilees, Indulgences, Croſſes, Incenſe, and an infinite number of meer Toys and Baubles, and that in theſe they have placed all Religion*; when I hear, I ſay, *Popery* thus deſcrib'd to the People by eminent Apologizers for the Church of *England*, I cannot conceive, but 'tis to let them know, what Notion to frame of it. And yet whoſoever ſhall ſuppoſe, that after ſuch Directions, they'l conceive a regular Idea of it, without a confuſion of *Faith* with its *Interpretations*, of *Doctrine* with its *Charges*, muſt conclude them to be better at *Separating* than the *Chymiſts*, and that in ſubtle *Diſtinctions* they are able to out-do *Ariſtotle* himſelf. But 'tis too much to be fear'd, that thoſe who expoſe *Popery* to the People after this way, are not willing they ſhould apprehend it in its genuine Purity, and as free from this diſingenuous mixture: 'Tis ſo like thoſe who impoſe upon the Multitude with artificial Monſters, by putting the wrong end forward, and ſhewing the Tail for the Head; that if they are not deluded into a Miſtake, 'tis becauſe they are not ſo credulous as they ſhould be, and ſuſpect ſomething of a Trick in him that makes the Shew.

And has not the *Reflecter* now reaſon to repent after all, that he gave occaſion to the *Replier* of explaining the Myſteries, he has diſcover'd in the Character of the *Papiſt Miſ-repreſented*; ſince the faults he endeavours to lay open, are not in the Miſ-repreſentation, but

but in those, who by Mis-representing the Papist, rais'd a false Idea of Popery in the Peoples heads? The Character of the *Papist Mis-represented*, was intended only, as the Author expresses himself in his Introduction, for a *Copy* of Popery as painted in the Imagination of the Vulgar: And being conform to that, 'tis exact and perfect: And if there be any faults in it, the blame must fall on those who drew the *Original*. But however we'll compound here again for this; if the *Replier* will but undertake to undeceive the People, and give them a more exact Notion of Popery, the *Reflecter* will undertake to reform the Character accordingly. But till then the Character of the *Papist Mis-represented* stands good; and till the abus'd people are taught to distinguish between *Antecedents* and *Consequents*, between the *Faith* of *Papists* and the *Consequences* charg'd against it; the Character must remain as it is; and any Reformation in it would but make it irregular, and unlike that from whence it was taken. The *Replier* therefore might very well have spar'd the almost Forty pages he has spent on this Subject; in which, tho' he has learnedly distinguish'd between matters of Dispute and of Representation: Yet this distinction being not to be found in the Notion the People have of Popery, 'tis nothing to our purpose. And the only end it can possibly serve for, is to let the World understand, how much the Papists are generally wrong'd in their reputation; whilst so many gross absurdities, which are often positively expos'd for Articles of their Faith, are here acknowledg'd by the *Replier* himself, not to be their *Faith*, but only the Interpretations and *Consequential charges* of their Adversaries.

These are the *Mis-representing* Arts and Faults he mentions. For the *Representing* Faults he alledges.

1. *That*

1. *That I deny the Belief of their Interpretations.* And the reaſon is, it may be, becauſe he thinks, no body charges us with *that Belief:* Which if it be but true, then I have not ſo much as contradicted any body, and there is no fault, I hope, in that. 2. *I generally own the Doctrines and Practices, which they charge us with.* And how could this poſſibly be otherwiſe, if they charge us with none, but what we expreſly profeſs to own? 3. *That in ſome caſes I diſown that to be the Doctrine and Belief of our Church, which manifeſtly is ſo and has been prov'd on them.* Then for all his word to the contrary, we are in ſome caſes charg'd with more than we expreſly profeſs to Believe. As for his *manifeſtly*, and his *proving*, let that go for no more than what it is, his Opinion: 'Tis none of mine, and I think 'twill be no bodies elſe, when the matter comes to a Tryal.

And here now we muſt turn over ſo many leaves till we meet with ſome other matter in the *Reply*. And the firſt that occurs, are ſome exceptions againſt the Rule obſerv'd by the *Repreſenter* in declaring the Faith of a Papiſt, who to clear himſelf from the Scandal of Interpreting the Council of *Trent* by his own private ſenſe and opinion, alledges the *Catechiſm ad Parochos*, which he had follow'd in delivering the ſenſe of the *Council*. This the *Replier* could not paſs by without an Anſwer, and therefore gives a ſatisfactory one. *And is he ſure*, ſays he, *that all his Repreſentations are conformable to the ſenſe of this Catechiſm? May he not play tricks with the Catechiſm, and expound that by a private Spirit, as well as the Council?* Thus a Queſtion or two is a full Confutation of the *Reflecter*.

He alledg'd again the Biſhop of *Condom*'s *Expoſition of the Doctrine of the Catholic Church*, which being approv'd and atteſted by the *Pope* himſelf, by ſeveral Cardinals

dinals and Biſhops, brought along with it the Authority of the *See Apoſtolic*. But this, it ſeems, works nothing upon the *Replier*: *Canus* has put a ſcruple in his head; and becauſe he finds in this Author, that *That is not to be accounted the judgment of the Apoſtolic See, which is given only by the Biſhop of* Rome *privately, maliciouſly,* (a word ſlipt over by the *Replier*) *and inconſiderately, or with the advice only of ſome few of his own mind*; he cannot therefore think, but that the Biſhop of *Condom*'s *Expoſition* comes ſhort of the Authority of the *Apoſtolic See*; and that the *Reflecter* is out, in taking ſhelter under one, whoſe *Authority is nothing*, as he ſays downright, *p.* 46.

This is anſwering, I confeſs, with a witneſs, thus to endeavour to overthrow ſo conſiderable and Reverend an Authority, without any Authority at all, beſides that of an ungrounded and ill-turn'd conſequence; *viz.* Becauſe that is not to be accounted the Judgment of the Apoſtolic See, which is given only by the Pope, *privately, maliciouſly, and inconſiderately, or with the advice only of ſome few of his own mind*; therefore this Learned Prelate's *Expoſition of the Catholic Faith* is to be thrown by, as of no Authority. So that our *Replier*, has here concluded without any more ado, that the approbation of this Book was only given *privately, maliciouſly, inconſiderately*, or elſe with the advice only of ſome few of the Popes own mind, otherwiſe the Conſequence will not hold. But to ſhew how little the *Replier* has weighed this matter, and with how little pains he can undervalue any thing when he pleaſes, I need only remit the Reader to the peruſal of the Book it ſelf, which is lately publiſhed in Engliſh; the *Advertiſements* affixt to it will ſatisfie him, that there has not a Book appear'd in this Age ſupported by greater Authority

thority than This. He'l find it examin'd with all due deliberation, approv'd with all ſolemnity imaginable, by Men of known Integrity, Piety and Learning, by Abbots, Cardinals, Biſhops, and by this preſent Pope himſelf, and recommended by his *Holineſs* to be Read by all the Faithful. He'l find it not only thus approv'd, but even twice Printed at *Rome* it ſelf, and in the Preſs of the Congregation *de Propaganda Fide*, Tranſlated out of the Original French into divers Languages, as *Latin*, *Italian*, *Engliſh*, *Iriſh*, *Flemiſh*, *High-Dutch*, and this done by Eminent Men of theſe Nations: So that beſides the Atteſtations of thoſe great Men there ſpecified, it may be ſaid to have the General Approbation of all theſe Catholic Prelates, who in propoſing it to their Flock, ſufficiently recommend it for a True Expoſition of the Doctrine of the Catholic Church. And yet notwithſtanding all this, with the *Replier*, it has not the Authority of the *Apoſtolic See*; Nay its *Authority is* juſt *nothing*.

Now methinks, I would willingly here know of the *Replier*, whether Thoſe *Great and Good Authorities* above mention'd, who pretend to make a Survey of the Faith and Doctrines of *Catholics*, have better Authority and Grounds for what they aſſert and charge, than this Reverend Prelate for the Expoſition which he gives. And whether it be not a great Myſtery, that every *Divine* of the Reformation ſhall be thought to have Authority ſufficient, for defaming the Church of *Rome*, with whatſoever extravagant Opinions he can but find in one or two Writers of what condition ſoever: And yet a *Catholic Prelate*, Eminent in the Church for his great Vertue and Learning, in expounding the Faith of his Church, with the Conſent, Approbation, and Authority of the Greateſt Men of his Communion, and even of his Supream Paſtor, ſhall be ſlighted, and thrown by as of

no Authority at all. For my part I cannot understand this uneven kind of Justice, and reasoning: Or why those who profess a Religion, and depend on it as to their Salvation, shall be thought less to understand it, than others who protest against it, and look no further into't, than to render it Ridiculous. But it must be so in an Age, in which a *Papist* is not to pass for a Christian, and must not be believ'd; we'l therefore go on to the other points.

And for the clearing the most material of them, we need not look beyond the Exposition deliver'd by this *Prelate*.

1*st*. As to the *Invocation of Saints* he declares expressly, that They have no other capacity of assisting us, *but only by their Prayers*. And tho the *Replier* pretends, there's no such limitation found in this Author; yet methinks he should not have been so positive, in a case, in which he's so easily disprov'd. The French Edition Printed at *Paris*, 1681. has it expressly, *pag.* 32. The First English Edition Printed likewise in *Paris* 1672. *pag.* 29. And now this last Correct Edition, which came forth the last Week, *pag.* 9. So that, tho the *Answerer* has made some little objection; yet the *Representer* is sufficiently vindicated, in thus declaring the Faith of a Papist: Since what he said is founded not upon his own private sense, but upon an Authority beyond all exception, besides that of meer *Cavil*.

2*ly*. And 3*ly*. As to the *Popes Personal Infallibility*, and the *Deposing Power*, the *Representer* declar'd, that, tho there were Men of his Communion maintaining these Points by way of *Opinion*, yet that they were no part of the *Catholic Faith*; and that *Papists* had no obligation from their *Church* of assenting to such Doctrines. And for thus delivering a matter of *Fact*, he has the Authority again of this Great *Prelate*, who having declar'd the

the *Primacy* of St. *Peter*, and acknowledg'd the ſame in his Succeſſors in the See of *Rome*, immediately adds, *As for thoſe things, which we know are diſputed of in the Schools, tho' the Miniſters continually alledge them to render this Power odious, it is not neceſſary we ſpeak of them here, ſeeing they are not Articles of the Catholic Faith. It is ſufficient we acknowledge a Head eſtabliſh'd by God to conduct his whole Flock in his Paths, which thoſe, who love Concord amongſt Brethren, and Eccleſiaſtical Unanimity, will moſt willingly acknowledge.* New Edit. P. 50.

And is not this a ſufficient diſcharge of the *Repreſenter* from all the exceptions of his Adverſaries? For if this learned Author, having propos'd the Primacy of St. *Peters Chair* to be acknowledg'd as the common Center of all Catholic Union, do's purpoſely wave all other Points relating to the Authority of that *Chair*, as being *no part of the Catholic Faith:* And his Book in this form is own'd and approv'd by the *Pope* himſelf, by the moſt eminent of the Cardinals, and other great Prelates of the Church after a moſt ſtrict examination, what ground of quarrel with the *Repreſenter* in his following this ſo Authentic a Rule? 'Twas the main deſign of the Biſhop of *Condom* in that Treatiſe to ſeparate the opinions of Divines and School Debates from the Doctrine of the Catholic Faith. And ſince he omitted to expound thoſe Points of the Popes Perſonal *Infallibility* and the *Depoſing Power* as not belonging to the *Catholic Faith*, with ſo full and Authentic an Approbation, as has been declared; where is the crime of the *Repreſenter* in not allowing them a place in that Liſt?

And here I cannot but run the venture of another ſmile from the *Replier*, upon the reinforcement of my former Propoſal. I deſir'd that the Deciſion of the Quarrel with the *Repreſenter* might depend upon the

Experiment of any ones being judg'd capable of being receiv'd into the Catholic Church, upon his assenting to matters of *Faith*, in that form as deliver'd by the *Representer*. The *Replier*, having smil'd first, thought it not fit to put it to that issue; but chose rather to own
P. 40. that the Faith, as declar'd by the *Representer*, was really the Faith of a *Papist*, excepting the *Deposing Doctrine*, and some other few Points. Here then let him make the Proposed Trial, if he pleases, or any Friend for him; and if, notwithstanding his refusal to admit the *Deposing Doctrine* and the *Popes Infallibility*, but as stated by the *Representer*, (that is, not as Articles of Catholic Faith) he be not judg'd sufficiently qualified as to those Points, to be receiv'd into the Communion of the *Roman* Catholics, I will grant he has reason to charge the *Representer* not to have done his part in those Particulars. This will be a much shorter and surer Conviction than twenty *Answers* and *Replies*, fit only to cast a Mist before the Readers Eyes, and which such a Trial as this will quickly dissipate.

And this now is all that is requisite for a full Vindication of the *Representer*. For it being frankly own'd by
P. 40. the *Replier* himself, that he has made a *true Representation* of the *Faith* of a *Papist*; with the exception only of some few Points. And it being here made evident, that what the *Representer* deliver'd as to those very Points, is according to the Sense of the *See Apostolic*, of the greatest Prelates, nay, I may say, of the whole Church: *The Papist Mis-represented and Represented* stands untouch'd: And all that has been said against it, have been nothing more, than so many artificial Endeavours to perswade the World, that the *Protestant* understands better what the *Faith* of a *Papist* is, than the *Papist* do's himself; which will be easily answer'd after his manner, with a smile.

What

What the *Replier* adds after this, belongs not to the *Repreſenter*, who being to *Repreſent*, and not to *Diſpute*, is not concern'd with thoſe tedious Arguments; however, not to be uncivil, we'l go ſo far with him, tho' it be out of our way.

1. He proves at large, that all *Definitions of Faith*, declar'd in General Councils, are not concluded with *Anathema's*; and in this we willingly agree with him: But this do's not at all prove, that whatſoever is declar'd in ſuch a Council without an *Anathema*, is an Article of Faith; and therefore nothing againſt us deſerving any farther anſwer. P. 51.

2. He endeavours to prove the *Depoſing Power* not to be a matter of *Diſcipline* and *Government*, but to be a Point of *Doctrine*; and this from a Principle lately publiſh'd in the Vindication of Dr. *Sherlock*'s Sermon, *viz.* that *To decree what ſhall be done, includes a virtual Definition of that Doctrine on which that Decree is founded.* And this he ſays, *as we have been lately told.* But what reſpect can I poſſibly have for what has been lately told us by another hand, ſince the *Replier* himſelf, however he urges it in one Page, plainly undervalues it and contradicts it in his very next; where he tells us, that in the Council of the Apoſtles at *Jeruſalem* there was a *Decree of Manners*, yet *it contain'd no Definition of Faith.* And for my part, I think the *Replier* in the right, and muſt needs ſtand with him againſt the *Vindicator* of the Sermon; that *to Decree what ſhall be done, do's not include a virtual Definition of Doctrine.* And the Example produc'd by the *Replier* evidently ſhews it: For tho' the Apoſtles in their Council (*Acts* 15.) decreed *abſtinence from Blood and ſtrangl'd Meats:* yet this Decree of *what was to be done*, did not include a *virtual Definition of that Doctrine on which the Decree was founded:* For, P. 53. P. 65.

if

if it had: then the *Doctrine of abſtaining from Blood and ſtrangl'd Meats* had been an *Article of Faith*; which I am ſure is not agreeable either to the Principles or Practices of either of our Churches. And the Reaſon of this may be, becauſe Decrees of *what ſhall be done*, are often made with relation to particular Circumſtances, of *Time*, *Perſons*, *Place*, *&c.* and not built upon Definitions of *Faith*, but upon Prudential Motives, upon Probable Opinions upon the Teſtimonies and Informations of Men; and ſo may be ſuſpended or quite abrogated, as alſo confirm'd anew, or wholly chang'd, according to the alteration of Circumſtances: Nothing of all which can ſtand with Articles of *Faith*, which being the indiſpenſible Doctrine of *Jeſus Chriſt*, are not ſubject to change or alteration.

P. 54. 3. But ſuppoſe this Decree to be rank'd only among the *Decreta Morum*, which concern only the Diſcipline and Government of the Church; yet our Adverſary here urges out of *Canus* and *Bellarmine*, That General Councils cannot err even in ſuch Decrees, when they relate to things neceſſary to Salvation, and concern the whole Church. And when the *Replier* has prov'd the *Depoſing Decree* to be of this Nature, and eſteem'd as ſuch by our Church, he may then deſerve a farther Conſideration.

What the Replier adds of this Subject, (p. 57.) That the *Pope* permits the poſitive Aſſertors of the *No-depoſing Power* to paſs without any Cenſure of Hereſie, becauſe he *wants Power to do it*, is ſpoke like an *Oracle* I confeſs; but becauſe theſe are ceas'd now adays, we may very well ſuſpend our Aſſent, till we have ſome better Argument, than his bare Aſſurance of what the Pope *would do* if he had Power.

P. 63. The laſt Argument is concerning the *Veneration of Images*. And tho' the *Anſwerer* was willing, without any

any more ado, to condemn the Papists of *Constructive Idolatry* from some external Acts of Adoration us'd before Images; yet our *Replier* readily grants, that those Actions are in themselves *indifferent, and capable of being paid to God and Men*, and to be us'd as the Expressions either of a *Civil* or a *Religious* Honour. But he has given us an infallible Mark, by which to distinguish between *Civil* and *Religious* Honour, notwithstanding the very *same external Actions* being us'd in both; and 'tis, that *Civil relates to this World*, and *Religious to the Invisible Inhabitants of the next*. This, he says, is a Distinction allow'd by all the rest of Mankind; and tho' *by all the rest* he seems willing to exclude me, yet since he has given his Word for it, I'le come in for one of that number, at least so far as to suppose it. So that here we have it now laid down as a Principle by common agreement, that *External Actions of Honour* paid to things relating to this World, is a *Civil Honour, Respect, Veneration, or Worship*. And when they are paid to things relating to the Invisible Inhabitants of the next, 'tis a *Religious Honour, Respect, Veneration, or Worship*. And hence 'tis concluded by him, That these *External Acts* of Honour express'd to any *Image*, that has Relation to some Invisible Being, must of necessity be a *Religious* Honour. This is what the *Replier* proves, and we at present agree to. But if he thinks, as he says, that this *puts an end to the Dispute*, I think him mistaken, we being as yet only in the beginning. For tho' it hence follows that Papists give a *Religious* Honour to Holy Images, yet till it be proved that *all Religious* Respect and Honour, is *so a Divine Honour*, as to make a *God* of the thing to which it is paid, at least *constructively*; he has not concluded Papists to be Idolaters, or guilty of constructive Idolatry; which P. 66.

is

is the thing he intended and undertook. And that he cannot possibly prove it from these Principles, without proving *too much*, and bringing himself in for a share, I think may easily be made appear.

For if Papists must be condemn'd of this constructive Idolatry, because they use *External Acts of Adoration* to an Image, which has a Relation to some invisible Being: must not all those come into the same List, who use the like *External Acts of Adoration* to other things, which have a like Relation to the same invisible Being? What excuse shall there be for him, who *Bows* to the *Altar*, or *Communion Table*, to the Name of *Jesus*, &c. All these things Relate to the invisible Inhabitants of the next World, and all External Acts express'd to them must by consequence be a *Religious Worship*: Then, in
P. 67. the words of our *Replier*, *If to Worship any Invisible Being, be to give Divine Honours to it; then to be sure, to Worship the thing Relating to such an Invisible Being, must be Religious Worship also. For if the Worship be refer'd to that Invisible Being, which the thing relates to, it cannot be Civil, but Religious Honour*; and whosoever gives *Religious Honour* to a thing, do's immediately ascribe Divinity to the object of that Worship, and in our *Repliers* Phrase, by *construction of Fact* is an Idolater.

And now how many here are included in this consequence? Certainly as many as admit of any Religious Respect besides to God; which yet the *Replier* himself was not unwilling (*p.60.*) to give to Reliques, allowing a *due Veneration and Religious Decency to the Bodies of*
Def. p. 862, 603. *Saints and Martyrs*: And the Learned Dr. *Stillingfleet* is well enough dispos'd to acknowledge a *Reverence and Religious Respect* due to Sacred Places and Things. So that I believe the *Replier* has overshot himself in this Argument: And that upon consideration, he will admit of

of some *Degrees* in *Religious*, as well as in *Civil* Honour: And that every thing is not immediately set up for a *God*, which is honoured with a Religious Respect, however this Honour may be ultimately terminated in God.

And this thought now brings into my mind, a close piece of Arguing us'd by the *Replier*, in urging this matter; and it lies thus: (*p.* 66.) *Civil respects are confin'd to this World*; But *we have no intercourse with the other World, but what is Religious*: Therefore *as the different kinds and degrees of Civil Honour are distinguisht by the sight of the Object, to which they are paid, tho' the External Acts of the same: So* (says he) *the most certain mark of distinction between Civil and Religious Worship is this, that the one relates to this World, the other to the invisible Inhabitants of the next.* Here we have a *Consequence* and a *Comparison*, and both so excellent in their kinds, that if any better connexion can be found in them, than betwixt the *Monument* and the *May-pole*, it must be by one, who has found one trick more in *Logick*, than ever *Aristotle* knew. If instead of his *So* in the end of his *Conclusion*, he had made this application, *So are the different kinds and degrees of Religious Honour distinguisht by the Intention of the Givers, or by some visible representation, or determination of other circumstances.* This might have been inferr'd with some dependance on the Premises: And by it we might have compounded for the matter in hand: But as the *Replier* has it, it neither proves, nor is any thing.

Another Argument we have just before this, which proves again *too much*, and is so unlucky as not to harm us, without cutting the Throat of his own Cause: The force of it may be thus expres'd: *No intention can alter the nature of Actions, which are determin'd by a Divine or Humane Law*; Therefore *since the External*

Acts of kneeling or bowing to or before an Image, are determinately forbidden by the Divine Law, the intention of doing no evil in them, cannot excuse them from Sin. For do's not this as ſeverely ſtrike at the *Bowing down* to the *Altar*, and *Kneeling* to the *Sacrament* as at us? For thoſe very *Actions* are part of the *Divine Worſhip*, and *Bowing down* is the very *Idolatrous* Action expreſly forbid in the Commandment: And then, *if there be any ſuch thing*, (as the Replier ſays here) *as External and Viſible Idolatry, it muſt conſiſt in External and Viſible Actions; for we can never know what Mens intentions are, but by their Actions; and then* (ſays he) *if Men do ſuch Actions as are Idolatrous, how can the intention excuſe them from Idolatry?* So that by this way of reaſoning he can never throw us down, but we muſt fall *both together*. For tho' the *Sacrament*, or the *Altar* are not expreſs'd in the Commandment; yet ſince the *External Action of Adoration* is a *Religious and Divine Worſhip* (according to the Repliers Principle before eſtabliſh'd) the *Bowing down* and *Kneeling to them* cannot be excus'd from the guilt of *Conſtructive Idolatry*. And whatſoever hole the *Replier* can poſſibly find, to get out at with his *Altar*, the *Repreſenter* will eaſily follow him at the ſame with his *Image*.

But that the *Replier* may ſee, how far his Argument concludes, I would fain know whether a *Quaker* might not as reaſonably make uſe of the ſame, for the juſtifying his *Yea's* and his *Nay's*, and his other points of *Quakeriſm*? For if he ſhould ſay; *No intention can alter the Nature of Actions, which are determin'd by a Divine or Humane Law*: But *Swear not at all, Neither be ye called Maſters*, and *let your Communication be Yea, Yea, Nay, Nay*, are Actions or things determined by the Divine Law: Therefore the *Intention of doing no evil in them* cannot

Mat. 5. 24.
Mat. 23. 10.
Mat. 5. 37.

canot excuſe the doing otherwiſe than is there determin'd from the guilt of ſin. This has equal force from a *Quaker* as from a *Replier*, and makes evident, that the ſame Arguments which perſwade to a *Reformation* from *Popery*, do upon the ſame grounds plead ſtill for a *farther Reformation*.

Thus far have I follow'd the *Replier* beyond my buſineſs of *Repreſenting*, and I hope I have ſo far oblig'd him in it, that however he has Queſtion'd my *Honeſty*, he will not at leaſt, now call me *Uncivil*. Before I take my leave, I will be ſo free as to offer him a Requeſt or two, which will not be thought unreaſonable, I hope, ſince he himſelf has put them into my Mouth.

1. That he will uſe his intereſt with *Proteſtants*, to hold to what he ſays they do, and charge us with nothing, but what we expreſly Profeſs to Believe and Practiſe.

2. That they pick not up the Abuſes of ſome, the Vices and Cruelties of others, the odd Opinions of particular Authors, and hold theſe forth for the *Doctrine* and *Practice* of our Church. And that in charging any Practices, they charge them upon no more than are concern'd.

3. That as often as they tell what they think of our *Doctrines* and *Practices*, They would likewiſe at the ſame time inform their Hearers, that thoſe Thoughts are, as the Replier ſays, *Opinions*, *Interpretations* and *Conſequences* of their own, concerning our Doctrine, and not our *avow'd Doctrine*; But that we think as ill of thoſe Crimes which they charge, as they themſelves do; and that we, our Doctrine and Practices, are as free from them, as they think of their own; and that in *this* conſiſts the Difference betwixt us.

Theſe

These are but very Reasonable Requests, I think, and what every Man may very well expect from his Christian Neighbour; they being not so much Favours as Duties: And what every one, who understands that Golden Rule, of *Doing as they would be done by*, will comply with without long entreaties. This is desir'd by those of the Reformation too, who require in their Synod of *Dort*, that *None judge of the Faith of their Churches, from Calumnies pick'd up here and there, or passages of Particular Authors, which are often falsly cited, or wrested to a sense contrary to their Intention: But from the Confessions of Faith of their Churches, and from the Declaration of their Orthodox Doctrine unanimously made in that Synod.* And this is a caution of so great importance, that where 'tis not observ'd, 'tis no wonder to see Men contending for the Truth of Christianity, and to lose it amidst their Uncharitable Dissentions.

Con. Syn.

'Twas my intention not to increase, but to diminish these heats, and for this end I put forth the double Character of a *Papist Mis-represented and Represented.* 'Twas this was the design of the Bishop of *Condom* in his *Exposition of the Faith of the Catholic Church*, and of the Clergy of *France*, in the *Acts of the General Assembly* lately publish'd. The method is inoffensive, and free from provoking Reflections; and if by this I have let the World know what our *Church Believes* and *Teaches*, 'tis what I intended: And as for disputing I leave that to such, who think it worth their while.

F I N I S.

63130